

JAN 03 2007

009/013

Art Unit 2189  
Serial No.: 10/633,257

Reply to Office Action of: 11/20/2006  
Attorney Docket No.: K35A1307

**REMARKS**

**SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Peikari for the interview conducted on December 22, 2006. The following summarizes the substance of the interview, in accordance with the guidelines provided by MPEP 713.04.

- (A) No exhibit was shown, and no demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Claim 21 was discussed in the context of a potential amendment.
- (C) The teachings of Grimsrud *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,000,077) were discussed.
- (D) Proposed amendments to Claim 21 were discussed. Amended Claim 21 is the result of those discussions.
- (E) The general thrust of Applicant's arguments presented at the interview was that Grimsrud does not teach or suggest the cache control system as claimed. Agreement was reached with the Examiner that Grimsrud would not read on the claim as amended.

Art Unit 2189  
Serial No.: 10/633,257

Reply to Office Action of: 11/20/2006  
Attorney Docket No.: K35A1307

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application and for the interview granted on December 22, 2006. By way of summary, Claims 21-44 were pending in this application. In this response, the Applicant has amended Claims 21 and 34. Accordingly, Claims 21-44 remain pending for consideration.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 21-24, 28-30, 34-37 AND 40-42 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office action rejected Claims 21-24, 28-30, 34-37 and 40-42 under § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 7,000,077, issued to Grimsrud *et al.* (Grimsrud). Applicant respectfully submits that Grimsrud does not anticipate these claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

During the interview of December 22, 2006, the Examiner and Applicant agreed that Claim 21 as amended overcomes the above rejection. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the clarifications made to Claim 21 were made to expedite prosecution of the instant application, and that the claim would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such clarifications.

Amended Claim 21 now recites, *inter alia*: "wherein the micro-controller cache system is responsive to the transmitted address to fetch micro-controller executable data stored at that particular transmitted address into the cache memory before the micro-controller requests that the micro-controller executable data be forwarded to the micro-controller, and wherein, after the micro-controller cache system has fetched the micro-controller executable data, the micro-controller requests execution of the micro-controller executable data." As discussed during the interview, Grimsrud neither teaches nor discloses these limitations.

In contrast, in Grimsrud, a host driver "tells the storage system which demand blocks to read, and gives the storage system the address of the driver's buffer memory. The storage system decides which blocks to prefetch and return with the demand blocks, according to the prefetch algorithms." Col. 6, ll. 20-25 (emphasis added). Thus,

Art Unit 2189  
Serial No.: 10/633,257

Reply to Office Action of: 11/20/2006  
Attorney Docket No.: K35A1307

the prefetch algorithms 112 taught by Grimsrud use the well-known caching methodology of receiving an address from a micro-controller, and then using that address to prefetch information at one or more prefetch addresses derived from the received address, as discussed in the background of Applicant's specification (p. 1, ll. 22-24). Grimsrud does not teach or suggest a cache demand circuit for receiving an address from a micro-controller and fetching micro-controller executable data stored at that particular address into the cache memory before the micro-controller requests that the micro-controller executable data be forwarded to the micro-controller.

For at least these reasons, Claim 21 should not be rejected as anticipated by Grimsrud.

Claim 34 has been amended similarly to Claim 21 to recite: "caching the micro-controller executable data stored at that particular transmitted address in the cache memory before the micro-controller requests that the micro-controller executable data be forwarded to the micro-controller; and after the micro-controller executable data has been cached, requesting execution of the micro-controller executable data at the micro-controller." Grimsrud neither teaches nor discloses these limitations.

For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 21, Applicant submits that Grimsrud neither teaches nor discloses these steps.

For at least these reasons, Claim 34 should not be rejected as anticipated by Grimsrud.

Claims 22-33, which depend from Claim 21, and Claims 35-44, which depend from Claim 34, are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons articulated above, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Art Unit 2189  
Serial No.: 10/633,257

Reply to Office Action of: 11/20/2006  
Attorney Docket No.: K35A1307

**REJECTION OF CLAIMS 25-27, 31-33, 38-39 AND 43-44 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Office action rejected Claims 25-27, 31-33, 38-39 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Grimsrud in view of U.S. patent no. 6,789,132, issued to Hoskins (Hoskins).

**REFERENCES FAIL TO TEACH ALL OF THE CLAIMED ELEMENTS**

Applicant respectfully submits that Grimsrud, in view of Hoskins does not render the above claims obvious. See M.P.E.P. § 2143 (stating that in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a claim, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations).

The particular limitations discussed above with reference to Claims 21 and 34 are not taught or suggested by Hoskins. For at least these reasons, Claims 21 and 34 should not be rejected as obvious over Grimsrud and Hoskins.

Therefore, Claims 22-33, which depend from Claim 21, and Claims 35-44, which depend from Claim 34, are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons articulated above, and because of the additional features recited therein.

JAN 03 2007

Art Unit 2189  
Serial No.: 10/633,257

Reply to Office Action of: 11/20/2006  
Attorney Docket No.: K35A1307

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the rejections. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1209.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 3, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Jason T. Evans, Esq.  
Reg. No. 57,862

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.  
20511 Lake Forest Drive  
Lake Forest, CA 92630  
Tel.: (949) 672-9474  
Fax: (949) 672-6604